

# AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

GEORGE MEANY  
President  
  
WM. F. SCHMITZLER  
Secretary-Treasurer  
  
JOHN W. LIVINGSTON  
Director of Organization



## AGRICULTURAL WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

NORMAN SMITH, California Director  
805 EAST WEBER AVENUE  
STOCKTON 3, CALIFORNIA  
HOWARD 6-0384

REGISTRATION NO. 9

### TAX-SUPPORTED STRIKEBREAKERS?

Statement of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO,  
for a hearing <sup>To be</sup> conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor,  
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1960<sup>a</sup>

#### I. Introduction

Federal regulations implementing the Wagner-Peyser Act, under which all public employment offices function, provide:

No person shall be referred to a position the filling of which will aid directly or indirectly in filling a job which (1) is vacant because the former occupant is on strike or is being locked out in the course of a labor dispute, or (2) the filling of which is an issue in a labor dispute.

For the first time in history, so far as we know, the agencies which administer the country's public employment offices were challenged this spring as to whether the above regulation applied to strikes and lockouts in the industry of agriculture. Since there was nothing in the Wagner-Peyser Act suggesting the exemption of any industry, the California Department of Employment and, in turn, the U.S. Department of Labor, ruled that the regulation did apply. Grower representatives have challenged this ruling.

The Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation has obtained a Superior Court order requiring the Department of Employment office in Marysville to refer workers to the world's largest pear orchard, the Dantoni Ranch, at which a strike is in progress. This order is currently being tested in the Courts.

The government agencies' interpretation is being challenged, furthermore, through the medium of a public hearing in Washington, D.C., on August 22, 1960.<sup>a</sup> This hearing has been called at the insistence of growers and grower representatives, and is in effect addressed to the question, "Can the executive agencies re-interpret the Wagner-Peyser Act to exclude agricultural labor, without legislative mandate?"

The legal aspects of this question will be ably argued by attorneys representing agricultural workers, agricultural employers, and the government agencies involved. In this paper, we of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, should like, rather, to discuss a few of the questions' implications from the standpoints of economics, common sense, and morality.

#### II. Not As a Stranger

One of the principal arguments which agricultural employers use in support of their demand for a reinterpretation of the Wagner-Peyser Act is the contention that agricultural picketing is "stranger picketing". If these pickets are "strangers" (so the argument runs) there are not really any jobs vacant by reason of strike or lockout, and there is hence not really a bona-fide labor dispute. In a moment, we shall consider the question of whether or not the concept of vacated jobs is essential to the concept of a labor dispute. But for the time being, let us confine ourselves to a question of fact: are the pickets involved in agricultural strikes "strangers in the fields" or are they not?

On July 22, 1960, the Research Director of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee visited the Marysville area of California, unannounced. On that date, there were four strikes in progress in the area. Eleven pickets were on duty. Nine of these eleven pickets were interviewed, two being unavailable. Of the nine pickets who were interviewed, eight had been working at the <sup>same</sup> ranch they were picketing, immediately prior to the commencement of picketing. Several had worked at the same ranch in previous years. Following are some of the statements which were offered in the course of these interviews:

<sup>a</sup> After several postponements, this hearing was cancelled altogether.

We started work on Wednesday, July 20, picking fortunas (a variety of peach. Ed. Note). We were getting 14 cents a box. We made \$6.32 apiece for a full day's work. The other workers made about the same. There were 27 or 28 workers altogether. When we got into town that night, we found out that the union was asking 17 cents a box as a fair minimum. So we went out to the orchard the next morning, and we started picking at 14 cents, but one of us went to Mr. Biggs and told him we couldn't make it at that rate, and asked him for 17 cents. Mr. Biggs told him that if he didn't like it, he could pick up his check and get out. So at about 11:45 yesterday morning, we walked off, and we've been picketing ever since. Quite a few of the other members of the crew walked out with us.

C N and  
G S,  
Biggs Ranch, Butte County,  
July 22, 1960

At the Badasha Ranch, they were paying 17 cents all right, but it was poor picking. We told the boss we couldn't make it, and we asked for 20 cents. He didn't pay any attention. So fifteen of us walked out. Only three stayed out of an eighteen-man crew. We phoned the union. A man came out from the union and spent over an hour talking to the boss, trying to reason with him. The boss just got madder and madder, and threatened us all with arrest. What happened was that he ended up paying 20 cents all right, 'cause it's the only way he could've got his peaches in, but he was using all scabs. He wouldn't hire any of us back at the rate we had asked for. So we started picketing.

S O and  
L B,  
C. S. Badasha Ranch, Sutter County, July 22, 1960

I started working at Dantoni's on Tuesday. Conditions were terrible. The biggest trouble was that the pears weren't sized. They would cut you down for picking undersized until you didn't have nothing left. Four of us were going out from town together in a car -- C       , G       , D       , and me. But we all walked out together when the strike started. I'm happy to help with the picketing because I support this strike one hundred percent.

L B  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

I walked out from Marysville on Saturday night to the Dantoni Ranch -- about three or four miles, I guess. I stayed in the camp they got out there for four days. They were charging us \$2.70 a day. We didn't get nothing to eat hardly at all. After a couple of days, we kicked so much that they started giving us something to eat. We was sleeping eight in a room. Why, at the hop ranch where I was working just before I came on here, there was only two to a room, they fed good, and they only charged us \$2.25 a day.

We was getting \$1.10 an hour, and we was required to pick 2 boxes an hour -- 18 boxes a day. I got 19 boxes the first day; 23 on the second day; 25 or 26, I can't remember which, on the third day; and 30 on the 4th day. The fruit was fair to bad. It was all ring picking. On the second day, I remember, I had to pick three whole sets and part of a fourth -- almost 16 trees -- to get 23 boxes. And the foreman checked all the trees, so you know I wasn't missing nothing. That'll give you an idea how scarce the size pears was, and how a guy had to hump to make the quota. There was lots of grumbling among the workers about the conditions.

I heard on the evening of the fourth day I was out there that there was going to be a strike. It was on a Wednesday. I told the foreman I wanted my time. He said to turn it in the next morning. So I did, at 7:00 A.M. Then I walked off. When I went in to get my check, I never saw so many empty bunks. So I know there was lots and lots of other men walked off, too.

I asked if I could do picket duty, but they had more than they needed. I've asked several times since, and today they were able to put me on. I enjoy doing picket duty like this.

L M,  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

I was hired Sunday, and went to work Monday. This was the second year I worked for Dantoni's. Last year it wasn't so bad. But this year the most we could get was three boxes to the tree. When I came in for lunch on Thursday, I saw there was pickets at the gate. I ate my lunch, went in to the bunk house, took a shower, shaved, picked up my gear, got my check, and walked out with the others. You can't beat the idea of a union. All you've got to do is make it work. I expect I'll continue helping with this picketing until the thing is settled one way or the other.

H                  U                 .  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio  
Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

I heard they was starting picking at Dantoni's, so I walked out from Marysville on Saturday night. I hired out on Sunday, and went through the processing in, and started work on Monday. As soon as I heard tell about the strike, I checked in my boxes and walked off. That was Wednesday noon.

I'm a strong union man, and have been for thirty years. I've belonged to the Boilermakers, the Teamsters, and the Brotherhood of Structural and Ornamental Steelworkers. Ever hear of it? And now, of course, I belong to the Agricultural Workers. They sure need a union in agriculture. Imagine working with a short-handled hoe for ninety or eighty-five cents an hour. I don't see any reason why a union won't work in agriculture like it has everywhere else.

The way I figure it, these picket lines are doing plenty of good. Every time a scab crosses the line, it makes him stop and think. I know of at least four who walked off this morning for sure. I'm going to be glad to keep on helping with the picketing until we win.

C                  T                 .  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio  
Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

I started picking on the first day of the season this year. I believe it was July 10th. The fruit was too small. The best that a man could do was about three boxes an hour. They had a phony bonus deal, where you got 10 cents a box bonus, but you had to pick eighteen boxes before the bonus deal started. I know a thing or two about picking pears. I've done it every year for twelve years: Yakima, different places. I worked all last season right here at the Dantoni Ranch. Room and board was \$2.25 last year. It's \$2.70 this year.

After I'd worked three and a half days, I got wind of the strike, so I went out. I didn't want to scab. I'm supporting this strike because I want to better myself and help the other guys at the same time. Looks to me like a man should get as much pay as the next man for doing the same thing.

H                  H                 ,  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio  
Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

I've worked for Dantoni's five years altogether. Most of the time, I was a fieldhand, but part of the time I was a straw boss. This year I checked in on Sunday. That was the tenth of July. I worked three days, and they fired me on the fourth morning. The foreman said, "Sorry. Don't blame me for it. It came through the office." I'm practically certain it was because I'm a union member. They had stool pigeons all over the place in there, creating trouble. Looked like they was trying to provoke a strike. Lots of other men were being fired. I would say that 95% of the fruit on the trees was undersized. They only paid me for about half of the boxes I picked. We had an agreement about a bonus, but it was only an oral agreement, and I never got mine.

I've spent two days on the picket line so far. All the pickets I noticed had been working in the orchard before. But most of the workers inside the orchard were strangers. I never saw them before this year.

O                  K                 ,  
Dantoni Ranch (Di Giorgio  
Fruit Corporation),  
July 22, 1960

In a word, these workers had come to the picket lines "not as a stranger" but as employees who knew from personal experience why a strike was necessary, and who were prepared to return to their old jobs upon successful negotiation of the differences between worker and management representatives.

### III. The Right of Information

The evidence suggests that the real "strangers" involved in agricultural labor disputes are behind the picket lines rather than marching in them. But what if the reverse were the case? There is nothing in the Federal Regulations, nor in logic, nor in morality, which requires that pickets in agriculture, or in any other industry, be employees (or former employees) of the establishment they are picketing. In agriculture, particularly, picketing is not only a permissible but a necessary form of organizational activity. It is one of the few means available to workers' representatives of informing workers that a drive for better wages and working conditions, and stabilized labor-management relations, is under way.

We urge that all who attend this hearing or read the transcript bear in mind that agriculture is the last remaining industry in which employees are commonly isolated physically and socially from the larger community. For example, the Podesta Ranch in San Joaquin County, where there was a labor dispute during the recent cherry season, maintains a large labor camp, far from a public thoroughfare, totally inaccessible to the general public. For another example, the Dantoni Ranch, struck by the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee as these lines are being written, operates a labor camp <sup>accommodating</sup> several hundred men. If AWOC representatives attempted to enter these facilities for the purpose of informing the workers that negotiations were in progress, they would be subject to arrest. If we attempted to fly overhead in an airplane equipped with a loudspeaker, we would be subject to arrest in most California counties. There is almost no way, other than picketing, to convey to workers and potential workers the information to which they are entitled. Theoretically, it is illegal for a California labor contractor to recruit workers for such situations without telling them a labor dispute is in progress. Actually we have found this law widely violated.

So we picket. Surely California growers would not deny us the right to employ this basic educational technique. Surely they would not deny the right of their employees to access to information.

### IV. The Industry That Never Grew Up

Acting Secretary O'Connell's notification of these hearings, dated July 7, 1960, includes the following:

Agricultural employers actually or potentially involved in these disputes have complained that the prohibition against referrals in these regulations operates unfairly to their disadvantage, because of...a lack of a permanent labor force on any single farm sufficient to harvest its crop.

This language is very interesting. It says, in effect, that agricultural labor tends to be seasonal, but that agricultural employers have no intention of developing a seasonal labor force on their own. They evidently intend to continue indefinitely to demand that tax-supported agencies guarantee them their seasonal labor supply. They have broadened this traditional demand now to include a demand for tax-supported seasonal strikebreakers.

These basic assumptions on the part of growers are the nub of the present hearings. We should like to comment briefly upon these assumptions. First of all, it should be observed that agriculture, as such, does not require a large seasonal labor force. Only certain forms of agriculture make such demands. These forms of agriculture are large and heavily capitalized. They are sometimes called "corporation-type" farms, or "agribusiness," as distinguished from low-income farms which are operated with the labor of the farmer and his family and neighbors. Furthermore, the growers who have historically expected the government to provide them their labor, and now expect the government to provide them with strikebreakers, are growers of "intensive" as distinguished from "extensive" crops. These crops tend to be speculative in character. As one grower put it, "You make up in one year what you lost the previous five years."

In other words, the growers who are now asking for revocation or curtailment of Section 602.2, insofar as it applies to agriculture, are not actually farmers in the usual sense, but capitalists who have chosen to invest in a certain type of

risk venture. They knew -- or should have known -- what they were getting into. They knew -- or should have known -- that their investment required a large amount of labor at certain times of the year and relatively little labor at others. Any other class of businessmen in the country would have considered, before making such an investment, ways and means of developing a labor force appropriate to the nature of the enterprise. There are many other industries with high seasonality in employment. Not one of these other industries has ever had the audacity to suggest that it was the government's responsibility to provide it with labor. It is unthinkable that the canning industry, longshoring, lumbering, or construction should rely helplessly upon public employment agencies to supply their variable labor needs.

These other industries have always assumed their own responsibilities for a labor force. In times past, they carried out these responsibilities in a number of ways -- some of them, such as the waterfront shape-up, unsatisfactory and unacceptable. Today, every seasonal industry but agriculture has been decasualized, and the instrument by which this has been accomplished has been the union hiring hall.

For agriculture, therefore, to seek preferential treatment even beyond that it already enjoys, simply because of "the lack of a permanent labor force on any single farm," is wildly unreasonable. We do not hesitate to say that the very reason agriculture does not have an adequate labor force today is precisely because it has received so much preferential treatment for so long. The only ultimate solution to the agricultural labor "problem" is for agriculture to grow up -- by shouldering the responsibility for its own labor force.

#### V. Can Agriculture Eat Its Cake and Have It Too?

Growers attorneys maintain that the language of Section 602.2 of the Federal Register is inapplicable to strike situations in agriculture since it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to determine with certainty whether a given job "is vacant because the former occupant is on strike" or "is an issue in a labor dispute."

We can only regard this contention as disingenuous. Any difficulties in applying the terms of the Federal regulations to agriculture flow directly from the fact that the farm labor market is disorganized and chaotic. The fact the farm labor market is disorganized and chaotic flows directly from the unrelenting efforts of growers, their representatives, and their attorneys, to prevent its decasualization and organization.

If growers are really interested in linking particular workers with particular jobs, we would suggest, among other things, that they begin developing personnel departments in place of the labor contractor system. If growers are really interested in knowing whether their workers support a strike call or not -- if they are really interested in an avenue of appeal for what they consider unfair labor practices -- if they are really interested in an equitable pattern of labor management relations -- then we can suggest two very concrete things which they might do. We suggest, first, that they join with us in removing the agricultural exclusion from the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the law, after all, which makes it possible for other industries to avail themselves of the services of the National Labor Relations Board, to conduct representation elections, and so forth. It is the law, in a word, which facilitates and systematizes the orderly resolution of labor-management problems, an end which growers claim they desire.

We would suggest a second very concrete and constructive step which growers might take if they are seriously interested, for example, in knowing whether a majority of their employees support a proposed strike. And that is to sit down with the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, now, and develop the machinery for meaningful employer-employee relations. It is not necessary to wait until the agricultural exclusion is removed from the Taft-Hartley Act. That Act, be it noted, does not forbid collective bargaining in agriculture. It merely withholds the services of the government from the conduct of such bargaining. These services are desirable in many ways, but they are not essential to a beginning.

If growers are anxious to enjoy certain of the fruits of normal labor-management relations procedures -- as they claim they are -- we repeat that they must in logic join with us in working out such procedures between the two of us, while at the same time working for legislative changes which will make possible the intermediary services and good offices of government. But growers cannot have it both ways. They cannot have certain benefits of normal labor-management arrangements and at the same time avoid certain responsibilities inherent in such arrangements. They cannot reasonably expect to have their cake and eat it too.

#### VI. The Will to Negotiate.

Growers have attempted to garner sympathy by claiming piously that they are prepared to negotiate, but that the union gives them no advance notification of its wage and other requests. It is difficult to credit either half of this claim. In the first place, it is impossible to reconcile growers' statements of "readiness to negotiate" with their even more vigorous and frequent statements that there is no bona fide workers' organization and therefore no one to negotiate with.

Secondly, it is simply not true for any grower or growers' representative to say that the union withholds its recommendations until the last moment, and then calls strikes without affording employers the opportunity to weigh its recommendations. Such a claim rests upon the totally false assumption that the goal of the AWOC is strikes. Quite the contrary is the case. The goal of the AWOC, like every responsible labor organization, is the development of a system for orderly relations between employees and their employers. A strike is utilized only in the last extremity, and always with <sup>regret</sup> since it represents the breakdown--the very antithesis--of the orderly bargaining arrangements we seek.

Let us cite some cases in point. Members of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee met about three weeks in advance of the San Joaquin County cherry season, and formulated a wage recommendation. An AWOC negotiating committee notified the San Joaquin Cherry Growers Association of this recommendation at least two weeks before a single cherry was being picked in the county. The occasion received considerable coverage in the local press. AWOC stewards also notified individual cherry growers of the rate which had been discussed by Union and Association representatives. It is inconceivable that any cherry grower in San Joaquin County was unaware of the fact the "prevailing wage" this year was to be \$1.10 per bucket, with negotiated upward adjustments for particularly difficult working conditions.

Similarly, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee attempted to arrive at an understanding with growers, concerning peach picking rates, several weeks in advance of the main peach harvest. On July 4, 1960, for example, an AWOC representative sent the following letter to the Tri-Counties Agricultural Committee, representing growers of Sutter, Yuba, and Butte Counties, with the request that copies of the letter be sent to all the peach growers who were members of or on record with the Committee:

Dear Sir:

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, advises you that it represents the workers who are now or will be employed by you in the harvesting of your peach crop.

As the representative of these employees we request that you establish a minimum wage to be mutually arrived at--through negotiations.

There are other matters concerning working conditions, grievance procedures and job security that need to be discussed in a quiet fashion, in order that your peach crop may be harvested in a quick and efficient manner.

We respectfully request that you meet, either as an individual grower or through your Association, with a Committee of your employees and their representative, so that these matters may be discussed and decisions mutually arrived at.

We are prepared to meet with you at your earliest convenience. Please let us hear from you.

On July 15, 1960, still well in advance of the opening of the main peach harvest, Norman Smith, AWOC Director, sent the following letter to the manager of the California Canning Peach Association:

Dear Mr. Bunje:

In the interest of an expeditious and orderly harvest of the oncoming peach crop, we believe that pre-harvest planning of wages and conditions would be a substantial aid to both growers and workers.

Our union asks that you use your good offices to set up, at the earliest possible opportunity, a meeting between peach growers and ourselves for the purpose of conducting such exploration and discussion.

We shall appreciate hearing from you.

The replies to these letters were essentially the same: There is nothing we can do. Growers' organizations are unwilling to assume responsibility for negotiating with workers' representatives, even though many of these same organizations include "labor relations" among their statements of purposes. Indeed, growers' organizations are unwilling to use their mailing lists or other facilities <sup>even</sup> to inform their members that workers and worker representatives are anxious to discuss the conditions of the forthcoming harvests. What more could we have done in our efforts to apprise peach growers and others of worker sentiment? We do not have mailing lists of the members of commodity organizations. We do not have access to their meetings.

It is difficult for us to take very seriously growers' complaints about not being informed. It is difficult for us to avoid the impression that growers do not wish to be informed about workers' recommendations, and, in fact, are doing everything within their power to delay the day when they must sit down with us across a bargaining table and discuss our recommendations, together with their counter-recommendations, in advance of the season.

#### VII. The Laborer is Worthy of His Hire

Growers sometimes profess to see something sinister in the fact that the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee pay the workers who are on picket duty. Their implication seems to be, "If the strike really had the support of the workers, there would be no need to pay pickets."

If these growers would look a bit deeper into their consciences, they would find the answers to their own argument. Agricultural workers do not receive unemployment insurance while they are off the job, because they are excluded from all unemployment insurance legislation. Growers should know this, since this exclusion has been maintained through the years only at their insistence.

What is more, agricultural workers characteristically have no savings, since their low wages and the insecurity of their employment yield annual earnings of a subsistence level. <sup>at best</sup> Growers should know this, since it is their efforts which have prevented the extension to agricultural workers of minimum wage and other social legislation.

Finally, agricultural workers have no strike funds upon which they can call for income maintenance during periods in which they are involved in labor disputes. Growers should know this, since it is their efforts which have prevented the formation, to date, of successful and autonomous organizations of farm laborers.

And so it is that the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee pays its members who are on picket duty. Growers may not consider the laborer worthy of his hire. But we do. We shall continue to pay our pickets until such time as the conditions listed above have been changed and it becomes possible for agricultural workers to maintain themselves during labor disputes in the same ways as do ~~other industrial~~ workers during similar periods.

#### VIII. The Meaning of Perishable

It will be argued at this hearing, as it has been argued in the past, that the perishability of crops requires that agriculture be accorded unique exemptions from all the usual rules of labor-management relations. We do not believe this argument is supportable either on logical or moral grounds.

It may be pointed out, in the first place, that many agricultural commodities are perishable only slightly if at all. Merely to cite a few examples of crops which are important in California: cotton, sugar beets, oranges, walnuts and almonds may be harvested over an extended period with little or no loss of quality. We are brought

back once again to the fact that those who are insisting on the emasculation of vital Federal regulations represent the growers of only a few crops.

It should be noted, in the second place, that other industries dealing with perishable commodities not only survive but thrive under collective bargaining arrangements. Fish in the hold of a ship, <sup>for example</sup>, are even more perishable than fruits and vegetables, but the fishing industry, so far as we know, has never demanded tax-supported strikebreakers on this account.

As a matter of fact, logically the producers and processors of perishable goods should be seeking to strengthen the machinery of labor-management relations rather than to weaken it further. When labor conditions are as chaotic as they have traditionally been in agriculture, every employer is liable at any time to spontaneous, uncontrollable, unpredictable work interruptions.

In the past, this has usually taken the form of workers simply walking off one job and looking for another. Cherry growers from San Joaquin County have told us that they customarily suffer about 15% lost time through this process of a constant labor turnover, which may be thought of as countless one-man "wildcat strikes." This year, the milling about in the cherry orchards was reduced almost to nothing, since there was a wage floor which workers considered fair, and machinery existed for the adjustment of piece rates in situations where pickers "couldn't make it" at the standard rate. A number of growers acknowledged to AWOC representatives that this was the most satisfactory harvest in years. But none was courageous enough to deviate from the line demanded by Associated Farmers and other "Big Board" growers' organizations. None was willing to say publicly what so many knew privately to be true.

As one way of coping with the traditional reliance of domestic farm workers upon one-man "wildcats", agricultural employers have devised contract labor systems, based on foreign poverty so desperate that most contract workers are willing to endure, stoically, conditions intolerable to Americans. But even within this peculiar institution, the fragility of labor-management relations in agriculture may be observed. A San Joaquin County tomato grower, for example, relates that he lost a sizeable portion of his crop three years in a row because his Mexican Nationals decided without warning that they wanted to walk off the job.

We repeat, then, that if growers are seriously concerned about the perishability of certain fruits and vegetables, they must in logic be seriously concerned about the development of a stable labor force which arrives when needed in sufficient number, and remains as long as needed. There is only one way in which any industry has ever developed such a labor force, and that is through worker organization and collective bargaining which is conducted in advance of the season.

We must point out, in closing, that however deeply felt the growers' fears about perishable crops may be -- and we do not doubt they are in some cases deeply felt, indeed, although misguidedly -- we do not see how these fears can be permitted to dominate the political, administrative and judicial decisions which affect the lives of 2,500,000 hired farm workers.

Some, though by no means all, crops may be perishable. But so are human beings. And so are the conditions which make human beings fully human -- self-determination, justice, self-respect, the respect of others. These things must be cultivated, nurtured, harvested, and renewed just as surely as the things which grow in the soil. We say this not only on behalf of 2,500,000 farm laborers and their six or seven million dependents. We say this on behalf of every American. For when dignity is denied any group of Americans, the dignity of every American is to an extent eroded.

We suggest that the guiding question to be kept before this hearing, and before every discussion of agriculture and agricultural labor, is not whether crops shall perish, but whether the human spirit shall perish. If agreement can be reached on the primacy of human values, ways shall be found to produce the nation's foods and fibers with efficiency, with order, and with dignity.